

CONFIDENTIAL

Rec'd
div



ENGINEERING & PLANNING BRANCH
FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

I. FUNCTION

Manage a program which looks to the development of new equipments needed for the technical security programs of the Division.

ACTIVITY

For equipment developed in-house:

- A. Write the Request for Proposal.
- B. Evaluate proposals.
- C. Aid in negotiating the contract for the equipment.
- D. Serve as the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative.
- E. Monitor the performance of the contractor.
- F. Perform the acceptance testing for the equipment.

For research, development and engineering tasks done in our behalf by ORD and OTS:

- G. In conjunction with ORD or OTS, identify needed equipments.
- H. Together with ORD and OTS serve as contract monitors and observers.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

II. FUNCTION

Provide budget and planning functions for the Division.

ACTIVITY

A. Prepare Program Call; Annual budget and related papers.

B. Prepare special studies such as a Technical Threat Assessment or a five year projection of technical equipment needs.

III. FUNCTION

Perform special technical liaison.

ACTIVITY

A. Serve as an observer to the Technical Security Countermeasures Subcommittee's R&D Working Group.

B. Serve as a member of the R&D Working Group's Threat Assessment Task Force.

C. Serve as a member of the Special Reading Group.

CONFIDENTIAL

The Technical Security Division component that writes the Proposal Request ~~for to~~ developed, in house, new equipment needed for the technical security programs of the Division.

ACTIVITY CODE III, B, (b); 1

COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security Division/EPB
DATE:

EVALUATION:

What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)?



25X1A

Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes X No
Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity?

Agency

Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes X No
Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes X No
Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes No X
If so, how?

Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes No X
If so, where and why?

Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly? More properly? Yes No X If so, which component and why?

Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes No X If so, what?

Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes No X
If so, how?

Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more important than this one? Yes No X If so, what?

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY: The Technical Security Division component
Approved For Release 2000/09/02 : CIA-RDP83B00823R000700020026-1 Requests to
develop, in house, new equipments needed for
the technical security program of the Division.

ACTIVITY CODE: III, B, (b); 2 COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security
Division/EPB

EVALUATION:

DATE:

What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)?

25X1A

Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes X No

Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity?

agony

Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes X No

Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes X No

Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes No X

If so, how?

Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred
to another OS component or to another Office? Yes No X

If so, where and why?

Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly?

More properly? Yes No X If so, which component and why?

Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of
Watergate? Yes No X If so, what?

Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without
significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes No X

If so, how?

Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more
important than this one? Yes No X If so, what?

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY: The Technical Security Division component that aids the contracting Officer in negotiating the development of in-house designed equipments needed for the technical security programs of the Division

Approved For Release 2000/09/02 : CIA-RDP83B00823R000700020026-1

ACTIVITY CODE: III, B, (b); 3

COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security Division/EPB

EVALUATION:

DATE:

What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)?

25X1A

Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes ☒ No ☐
Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity?

Agency

Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes ☒ No ☐
Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes ☒ No ☐
Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes ☐ No ☒
If so, how?

Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes ☐ No ☒
If so, where and why?

Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly? More properly? Yes ☐ No ☒ If so, which component and why?

Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes ☐ No ☒ If so, what?

Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes ☐ No ☒
If so, how?

Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more important than this one? Yes ☐ No ☒ If so, what?

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY: The Technical Security Division component that serves as the contracting Officers' technical representative in the development of in-house designed security equipments.

Approved For Release 2000/09/02 : CIA-RDP83B00823R000700020026-1

ACTIVITY CODE III, B, (b); 4

COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security

Division/EPB

EVALUATION:

DATE:

What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)?

25X1A

Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes ☒ No ☐

Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity?

Agency

Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes ☒ No ☐

Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes ☒ No ☐

Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes ☐ No ☒

If so, how?

Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes ☐ No ☒

If so, where and why?

Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly?

More properly? Yes ☐ No ☒ If so, which component and why?

Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes ☐ No ☒ If so, what?

Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes ☐ No ☒

If so, how?

Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more important than this one? Yes ☐ No ☒ If so, what?

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY:

Approved For Release 2000/09/02 : CIA-RDP83B00823R000700020026-1

The Technical Security Division component that monitors the performance of the contractor in the development of in-house designed security equipment.

ACTIVITY CODE III, B, (b); 5

COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security

Division/EPB

EVALUATION:

DATE:

What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)?

[REDACTED]

25X1A

Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes ☒ No ☐

Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity?

Agency

Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes ☒ No ☐

Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes ☒ No ☐

Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes ☐ No ☒

If so, how?

Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes ☐ No ☒

If so, where and why?

Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly?

More properly? Yes ☐ No ☒ If so, which component and why?

Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of

Watergate? Yes ☐ No ☒ If so, what?

Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without

significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes ☐ No ☒

If so, how?

Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more

important than this one? Yes ☐ No ☒ If so, what?

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY: The Technical Security Division component that performs the acceptance testing of new equipments developed in-house for the Technical Security Programs of the Division.

Approved For Release 2000/09/02 : CIA-RDP83B00823R000700020026-1

ACTIVITY CODE III, B, (b); 6

COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security

Division/EPB

EVALUATION:

DATE:

What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)?

25X1A

Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes ☒ No ☐

Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity?

Agency

Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes ☒ No ☐

Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes ☒ No ☐

Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes ☐ No ☒

If so, how?

Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes ☐ No ☒

If so, where and why?

Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly?

More properly? Yes ☐ No ☒ If so, which component and why?

Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of

Watergate? Yes ☐ No ☒ If so, what?

Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes ☐ No ☒

If so, how?

Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more important than this one? Yes ☐ No ☒ If so, what?

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY: The Technical Security Division component
that works in conjunction with ORD and/or
Approved For Release 2000/09/02 : CIA-RDP83B00823R000700020026-1
OS in identify needed equipments.

ACTIVITY CODE: III, B, (b), 7

COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security
Division/EPB

EVALUATION:

DATE:

What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)?

25X1A

Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes X No
Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity?

Agency

Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes X No
Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes X No
Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes No X
If so, how?

Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred
to another OS component or to another Office? Yes No X
If so, where and why?

Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly?
More properly? Yes No X If so, which component and why?

Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of
Watergate? Yes No X If so, what?

Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without
significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes No X
If so, how?

Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more
important than this one? Yes No X If so, what?

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY: The Technical Security Division component
Approved For Release 2000/09/02 : CIA-RDP83B00823R000700020026-1
with ORD and
OTS in monitoring contracts for new equipment.

ACTIVITY CODE III, B, (b); 8

COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security

Division/EPB

EVALUATION:

DATE:

What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)?

25X1A

Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes ☒ No ☐

Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity?

Agency

Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes ☒ No ☐

Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes ☒ No ☐

Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes ☐ No ☒

If so, how?

Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes ☐ No ☒

If so, where and why?

Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly? More properly? Yes ☐ No ☒ If so, which component and why?

Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes ☐ No ☒ If so, what?

Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes ☐ No ☒ If so, how?

Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more important than this one? Yes ☐ No ☒ If so, what?

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY:

The Technical Security Division component
Approved For Release 2000/09/02 : CIA-RDP83B00823R000700020026-1
Divisions Program Call.

25X1A

Delete

31 mar 75

ACTIVITY CODE III, B, (b); 9

COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security
Division/EPB

EVALUATION:

DATE:

What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)?

Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes _____ No _____

Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity?

Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes _____ No _____

Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes _____ No _____

Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes _____ No _____

If so, how?

Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred
to another OS component or to another Office? Yes _____ No _____

If so, where and why?

Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly?
More properly? Yes _____ No _____ If so, which component and why?

Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of
Watergate? Yes _____ No _____ If so, what?

Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without
significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes _____ No _____
If so, how?

Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more
important than this one? Yes _____ No _____ If so, what?

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY: The Technical Security Division component
Approved For Release 2000/09/02 : CIA-RDP83B00823R000700020026-1
Divisions annual budget. 25X1A

Delete

31 Mar 75

ACTIVITY CODE III, B, (b), 10

COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security

EVALUATION:

Division/EPB

DATE:

What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)?

Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes ☐ No ☐
Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity?

Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes ☐ No ☐
Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes ☐ No ☐
Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes ☐ No ☐
If so, how?

Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred
to another OS component or to another Office? Yes ☐ No ☐
If so, where and why?

Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly?
More properly? Yes ☐ No ☐ If so, which component and why?

Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of
Watergate? Yes ☐ No ☐ If so, what?

Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without
significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes ☐ No ☐
If so, how?

Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more
important than this one? Yes ☐ No ☐ If so, what?

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY:

Approved For Release 2000/09/02 : CIA-RDP83B00823R000700020026-1

The Technical Security Division component responsible for preparing Special Studies such as a Technical threat assessment or a five year projection of technical equipment needs.

ACTIVITY CODE III, B, (b), 11

COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security

EVALUATION:

Division/EPB

DATE:

What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)?

25X1A

Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes X No

Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity?

Agency

Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes X No

Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes X No

Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes No X

If so, how?

Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes No X

If so, where and why?

Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly?

More properly? Yes No X If so, which component and why?

Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes No X If so, what?

Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes No X

If so, how?

Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more important than this one? Yes No X If so, what?

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY:
Approved For Release 2000/09

25X1A

ACTIVITY CODE III, B, (b), 12

COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security

EVALUATION:

Division/EPB

DATE:

What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)? 25X1A

Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes X No
Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity?

Agency

Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes X No
Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes X No
Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes No X
If so, how?

Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes No X
If so, where and why?

Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly? More properly? Yes No X If so, which component and why?

Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes No X If so, what?

Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes No X
If so, how?

Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more important than this one? Yes No X If so, what?

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY:

The Technical Security Division component that serves as a member of the R&D Working Group's Threat Assessment Task Force.

ACTIVITY CODE: III, B, (b); 13

COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security

EVALUATION:

Division/EPB

DATE:

What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)?

25X1A

Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes X No
Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity?

Agency

Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes X No
Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes X No
Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes No X
If so, how?

Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred to another OS component or to another Office? Yes No X
If so, where and why?

Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly? More properly? Yes No X If so, which component and why?

Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of Watergate? Yes No X If so, what?

Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes No X
If so, how?

Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more important than this one? Yes No X If so, what?

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY: The Technical Security Division component
Approved For Release 2000/09/02 : CIA-RDP83B00823R000700020026-1
that serves as a member of the Special
Reading Group.

ACTIVITY CODE: III, B, (b); 14

COMPONENT: OS/PTOS/Technical Security

EVALUATION:

Division/EPB

DATE:

What is (are) our reference(s) for this activity? Date(s)?

25X1A

Is (are) the reference(s) still in force? Yes X No

Who is (are) the beneficiary(ies) of this activity?

Agency

Do you feel the activity is still necessary? Yes X No

Do(es) the beneficiary(ies) feel it is still necessary? Yes X No

Can the activity be done more efficiently or less costly? Yes No X

If so, how?

Do you feel that responsibility for the activity should be transferred
to another OS component or to another Office? Yes No X

If so, where and why?

Can another component do the activity more efficiently? Less costly?
More properly? Yes No X If so, which component and why?

Does the activity include anything questionable in the light of
Watergate? Yes No X If so, what?

Can this activity be reduced in scope/size or discontinued without
significant effect on overall Agency security? Yes No X
If so, how?

Is there any activity not now being pursued by OS that you feel is more
important than this one? Yes No X If so, what?

☐ UNCLASSIFIED☐ INTERNAL
USE ONLY☐ CONFIDENTIAL☐ SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM: 25X1A

EXTENSION

NO.

Policy and Plans Group

5311

DATE

18 March 1975

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S
INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. OS/PTOS/Technical
Security Division/EPB

2. 25X1A

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

Under Objective B57104 the Office of Security will review and validate all Office of Security functions, activities...to ensure effectiveness, economy and efficiency. The attached documents represent two milestones under that objective. Milestone 1, the components identified their functions and activities. Milestone 2 was establishment of a format for evaluating these...activities. It is requested that the Engineering and Planning Branch review the attachment and:

- Certify that there are no deletions/corrections/additions to be made to the previous listing submitted by your office.
- Review the Identification of Activity statement on each evaluation sheet to ensure it fully equals to the comparable activity from your office listing.
- Use the attached format to evaluate each individual activity.